

## APPENDIX F

### RED PINES FEIS ERRATA II

#### CHAPTER III – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

##### SECTION 3.2 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS.

Page 3-5. Aquatic Restoration.

First paragraph add the following sentence. Adult Chinook passage improvement was completed on 0.2 miles of channel.

Second paragraph. Add to the second sentence...,including the Idaho Department of Fish and Game and Idaho Soil Conservation District.

Third paragraph. Add the following sentence. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game constructed and operated spring Chinook salmon hatching channel and acclimation facility in Red River from 1980 to 1986. The facility is currently operated for adult Chinook salmon collection and as a fishing pond

##### SECTION 3.5 WATER QUALITY.

Page 3-66. (Section 3.5.6.2 Sediment Yield). Table III-26 Sediment Yield Comparisons.

Subwatershed, Soda Creek. Replace the predicted sediment yield values in the year 2005. Change Alternative E from 21 to 25 % over base.

##### SECTION 3.9 VEGETATION.

Page 3-155 (Section 3.9.6.3 Structure – Timber Stand Density).

First paragraph. Add the following sentence. This table displays the objective by silvicultural treatment type for an average stand.

Table III-59. Replace the table and add the following footnotes.

**Table III-59 Changes in Stand tree Densities in the Project Area (all action alternatives)**

Size Class	Current Trees Per Acre	Clearcut Trees Per Acre <sup>2</sup>	Shelterwood Trees Per Acre <sup>3</sup>
Seedling to Small Tree (up to 14" DBH)	1,435	140	535
Medium Tree (14-21 inch DBH)	30	N/A	30
21 + inch DBH <sup>1</sup>	5	N/A	5
Total	1,470	140	570

<sup>1</sup> All large ponderosa and western larch trees (>21") will be retained (Design measure #34).

<sup>2</sup> Clearcut treatments are predominately in lodgepole pine stands and trees greater than 14 inches may not be present.

<sup>3</sup> Minimum number of trees per acre to be retained, except in seedling to small tree size class. Tree density will vary depending upon activity fuels treatments.

## **SECTION 3.12 WILDLIFE.**

Page 3-189. (Section 3.12.1 Introduction). The reference to elk units [Map15] changes to elk units [Map 16]. The reference to lynx units [Map 13] changes to lynx units [Map 14]. The reference to old growth units [Map 14] changes to old growth units [Map 15]. Reference to old growth management areas [Map 16] changes to old growth management areas Map 15]. The reference to habitat groups [Map 12] changes to habitat groups [Map 13].

Page 3-192. (Section 3.12.2.2 National Forest Management Act and endangered Species Act). Reference to Appendix A changes to Appendix A of the Wildlife Technical Report. Reference to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service list #1-4-05-SP-501 (dated 06/01/2005) is updated by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service list #SL-06-0084 (dated 3/01/2006).

Page 3-196. (Section 3.12.4.1 Existing Conditions). The reference to Table III-175 changes to Table III-75.

Page 3-196. (Section 3.12.4.2 Environmental Consequences). The reference to Table III-175 changes to Table III-75.

Page 3-198. (Section 3.12.4.3 Scope of the Analysis). The reference to Table III-60 changes to Table III-72.

Page 3-198. (Section 3.12.4.3 Scope of the Analysis). The reference to Table III-175 changes to Table III-75.

Page 3-198. (Section 3.12.4.3 Scope of the Analysis). The reference to Table III-174 changes to Table III-74.

Page 3-199. Table III-75 Red Pines project alternative comparison for threatened, sensitive, management indicator species, and Neotropical migratory birds.

Replace Fisher and Pine Marten acres with the following values to correct the analysis values.

Wildlife Species Habitat or Issue	Analysis Indicator	Alternative Comparisons				
		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	Alt E
Fisher	Available habitat acres defined by habitat groups 4, 7, 8, and 9 in medium and large tree sizes	7,188	6,817	6,878	7,025	7,076
Pine Marten	Available habitat acres defined by habitat groups 4, 7, and 8 in medium and large tree sizes	7,088	6,717	6,778	6,925	6,976

Page 3-202. (Section 3.12.5.2 Nez Perce National Forest). Reference to Table III-6 changes to Table III-77

Page 3-203. (Section 3.12.5.4 Red River Watershed). The reference to Map 12 changes to Map 13 Two references to Table III-178 change to Table III-78.

Page 3-204. (Section 3.12.5.5 Wildlife Use of Lodgepole Pine Habitat). The reference to USDA 2003d changes to USDA 2003f.

Page 3-206. (Section 3.12.5.6 Past Events Affecting Existing wildlife Habitat Conditions, Inventoried Roadless and wilderness Areas). Reference to Table III-179 changes to Table III-79

## Red Pines EIS – Record of Decision – Appendix F – FEIS Errata II

Pages 3-208 through 3-209. (Section 3.12.6 Wildlife Species Dropped From Detailed Analysis). Insert the following information. The primary reference is: Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 2005. Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Boise, Idaho.

**Peregrine Falcon/Black Swift:** There are no black swift species occurrence records documented on Nez Perce National Forest. All peregrine falcon occurrence records are in the Salmon River, outside of the project analysis area.

**White-headed Woodpecker/Flammulated Owl/Mountain Quail/Pygmy Nuthatch:** Known Nez Perce National Forest white-headed woodpecker species records are mile from the Red River watershed and all but one location is in the Salmon River. There are no records of pygmy nuthatch on Nez Perce National Forest. All records for mountain quail are in the Salmon River.

**Townsend's big-eared Bat:** All Nez Perce National Forest records are in the Salmon River.

**Fringed Myotis:** There are two occurrence of this species on Nez Perce National Forest; one in the Salmon River and one in the Selway River.

**Coeur d' Alene Salamander:** All Nez Perce National Forest records are limited to the Selway River. There is one record "close" to the Forest boundary in the Salmon River.

**Ringneck Snake:** There are no Nez Perce National Forest records of this species in the project area.

**Northern Leopard Frog:** There are no Nez Perce National Forest records of this species.

Page 3-214. (Section 3.12.7.2 Snags and Large Down wood Habitat, Cumulative Effects). Strike the reference to Wildlife Technical Report.

Page 3-215. (Section 3.12.7.3 Old Growth Habitat). Replace Table III-85 with the following to update the values relative to the Meadow Fire 2006.

**Table III-85 Red River old growth and replacement old growth acres and percentage**

Old Growth Unit	Potential Forested Unit Acres	Identified Old Growth (FP Standard ≥5%)				Identified Replacement Old Growth		Total Identified Old Growth and Replacement Old Growth (FP Standard ≥10%)			
		Forest Plan Appendix N Definition		North Idaho Guidelines (Green et al. 1992) Definition				Forest Plan Appendix N Definition		North Idaho Guidelines Definition	
		Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%
402	9,059	280	3	385	4	957	11	1,237	14	1,342	15
403	7,725	794	10	1,123	15	1,060	14	1,854	24	2,183	28
405	7,457	279	4	366	5	678	9	957	13	1,044	14
406	4,796	168	4	242	5	653	14	821	17	895	19
408	8,942	593	7	615	7	447	5	1,040	12	1,062	12
411	10,158	410	4	410	4	634	6	1,044	10	1,044	10
413	8,649	225	3	271	3	737	8	962	11	1,008	12
415	9,417	68	1	68	1	1,053	11	1,121	12	1,121	12
418	5,861	0	0	0	0	604	10	604	10	604	10
419	6,963	114	2	122	2	550	8	664	10	672	10
420	5,606	117	2	161	3	664	12	781	14	825	15
422	4,723	120	3	138	3	808	17	928	20	946	20
423	5,710	171	3	153	3	400	7	571	10	553	10
426	4,600	126	3	126	3	795	17	921	20	921	20
TOTAL	99,664	3,465	3	4,150	4	10,040	10	13,050	14	14,220	14

## Red Pines EIS – Record of Decision – Appendix F – FEIS Errata II

Page 3-216 (Section 3.12.7.3 Old Growth Habitat). Replace Table III-86 with the following to update the values relative to the Meadow Fire 2006.

**Table III-86 Old Growth Units combined to meet Forest Plan requirements.**

Old Growth Unit Combinations	Potential Forested Unit Acres	Identified Old Growth (FP Standard ≥5%)				Identified Replacement Old Growth		Total Identified Old Growth and Replacement Old Growth (FP Standard ≥10%)			
		Forest Plan Appendix N Definition		North Idaho Guidelines (Green et al. 1992) Definition				Forest Plan Appendix N Definition		North Idaho Guidelines Definition	
		Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%	Acres	%
402/420 303/509	33,744	2,925	9	3,157	9	2,796	8	5,721	17	5,953	20
403/405 406/411	30,136	1,651	6	2,141	7	3,025	10	4,684	16	5,175	17
408/413	17,591	818	5	886	5	1,184	7	2,002	11	2,070	12
415/418 419/304	36,003	1,977	6	2,353	7	3,214	9	5,191	14	5,567	15
422/426/301	18,974	1,263	7	1,671	9	2,049	11	3,312	17	3,720	20
423/510 511/516	18,512	2,048	11	2,437	13	1,401	8	3,449	19	3,838	21

Page 3-217. (Section 3.12.7.3 Old Growth Habitat, Cumulative Effects). Change “Refer to the Snags and Large Down Wood Appendix (F)...” to “Refer to the Snags and Large Down wood section and Appendix F...”

Page 3-219. (Section 3.12.7.4 Old Growth Associated Species – Goshawk, Fisher, Pine Marten, Pileated woodpecker, Moose Winter Range, Northern Goshawk Existing Conditions). In the first paragraph insert, “A 2005 assessment of Forest Service Northern Region goshawk habitat supports these previous assessments (Samson, 2005).”

Page 3-220. (Section 3.12.7.4 Old Growth Associated Species – Goshawk, Fisher, Pine Marten, Pileated woodpecker, Moose Winter Range, Northern Goshawk Direct and Indirect Effects, Alternatives B, C, d and E). At the end of the first paragraph, add the following statement:

“Suitable goshawk habitat treated under each action alternative would not be considered suitable after treatment. Table III-88 displays goshawk habitat acres treated by alternative. Goshawks are known to alternate between existing nests. These existing alternate nests may be located within or adjacent to the proposed treatment units. The proposed actions under all action alternatives could remove or make these otherwise viable nests unusable. The number of acres treated under each alternative is one way of assessing the potential effects on unknown alternate nest sites between alternatives (see Table III-88). When considering the action alternatives, Alternative B has the greatest potential to affect goshawks, Alternative E has the least potential and Alternatives C and D are intermediate. Alternative A would have no effect on goshawk habitat. Under all action alternatives, Project Design Measures 7, 29, 35 and 37 and Mitigation Measure N aid in habitat protection and management of potential human disturbances.”

## Red Pines EIS – Record of Decision – Appendix F – FEIS Errata II

Page 3-221. (Section 3.12.7.4 Old Growth Associated Species – Goshawk, Fisher, Pine Marten, Pileated woodpecker, Moose Winter Range, Fisher Existing Conditions). In the first paragraph, change “Habitat groups 4, 7, and 8 in the large tree size class...” to “Habitat groups 4, 7, 8, and 9 in the medium and large tree size classes...” The reference to Map 12 changes to Map 13. Strike the comment referencing 442 acres or less than 1 percent of the watershed.

Page 3-221. (Section 3.12.7.4 Old Growth Associated Species – Goshawk, Fisher, Pine Marten, Pileated woodpecker, Moose Winter Range, Fisher Direct and Indirect Effects, Alternative A). Replace reference to “...442 acres of fisher summer habitat...” with “...7,188 acres of fisher habitat...”

Page 3-221. (Section 3.12.7.4 Old Growth Associated Species – Goshawk, Fisher, Pine Marten, Pileated woodpecker, Moose Winter Range, Fisher Direct and Indirect Effects, Alternatives B, C, D and E). Replace paragraphs two and four with:

“All silvicultural prescriptions proposed in all action alternatives would potentially convert suitable fisher habitat to unsuitable condition due to canopy cover removal. Most of the proposed fuel reduction occurs in habitats with trees less than 14 inches DBH, however, some occurs in medium and large tree size classes in habitat groups 4, 7, 8, and 9. Table III-90 indicates Alternative B would treat 229 acres of potential fisher habitat, Alternative C would treat 182 acres, Alternative D would treat 126 acres and Alternative E would treat 112 acres. More specifically, clearcutting would occur on 19 acres of potential fisher habitat in alternative B, C, and D. Alternative E would clearcut 18 acres of potential fisher habitat. In habitat type groups 4, 7, 8, and 9, action alternatives propose 94 (Alt. E) to 168 (Alt. B) acres of fuels reduction in medium size trees (14-20.9 inches DBH) and 18 (Alt. E) to 61 (Alt. B) acre in large size trees (≥21 inches DBH).”

Page 3-222. (Section 3.12.7.4 Old Growth Associated Species – Goshawk, Fisher, Pine Marten, Pileated woodpecker, Moose Winter Range, Fisher Direct and Indirect Effects, Alternatives B, C, D and E). Replace Table III-90 Red River Fisher Habitat and Acres Treated By Alternative with the following table:

**Table III-90: Red River Fisher Habitat and Acres Treated By Alternative**

Species	Analysis Indicator	Alt. A	Alt. B	Alt. C	Alt. D	Alt. E
Fisher	Available habitat acres defined by habitat groups 4, 7, 8, and 9 in medium and large tree sizes in Red River Watershed	7,188	6,959	7,006	7,062	7,076
	Acres treated in potential fisher habitat	0	229	182	126	112

Page 3-224. (Section 3.12.7.4 Old Growth Associated Species – Goshawk, Fisher, Pine Marten, Pileated woodpecker, Moose Winter Range, Pine Marten Existing Conditions). Replace the first sentence of paragraph one with the following: “Marten habitat can be characterized in the Red River watershed as habitat groups 4, 7, and 8 in the medium and large tree size classes. Table III-94 shows there are 7,088 acres (7 percent) of this habitat in Red River watershed.”

Page 3-224. (Section 3.12.7.4 Old Growth Associated Species – Goshawk, Fisher, Pine Marten, Pileated woodpecker, Moose Winter Range, Pine Marten Direct and Indirect Effects, Alternatives B, C, D and E).

## Red Pines EIS – Record of Decision – Appendix F – FEIS Errata II

Page 3-224. (Section 3.12.7.4 Old Growth Associated Species – Goshawk, Fisher, Pine Marten, Pileated woodpecker, Moose Winter Range, Pine Marten Direct and Indirect Effects, Alternatives B, C, D and E). Replace the first three sentences of paragraph two with the following: “There were 7,088 acres identified as potential pine marten habitat in Red River watershed. Pine marten habitat is not altered by removing pole and small sized dead and dying lodgepole pine trees. Section 3.9.6 indicates proposed treatments would alter size classes in habitats less than 14 inches DBH. Replace Table III-94 Red River Watershed Pine Marten Habitat and Treatment Acres by Alternative with the following table:

**Table III-94 displays Red River watershed pine marten habitat and treatment acres by alternative.**

Species	Analysis Indicator	Alt. A	Alt. B	Alt. C	Alt. D	Alt. E
Pine Marten	Available habitat acres defined by habitat groups 4, 7, and 8 in medium and large tree sizes in Red River Watershed	7,088	6,859	6,906	6,962	6,976
	Acres treated in potential fisher habitat	0	229	182	126	112

Page 3-235. (Section 3.12.7.6. Generalist species and Habitat – Lynx, wolf, wolverine, Elk (Winter/Summer Range), Neotropical Migratory Birds, Lynx Direct and Indirect Effects). Change reference to Map 13 to Map 14. The reference to Table III-12 changes to Table III-103. Change two references to the Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (2004) to year 2000 (Ruediger, B. et al. 2000).

Page 3-240. (Section 3.12.7.6. Generalist species and Habitat – Lynx, wolf, wolverine, Elk (Winter/Summer Range), Neotropical Migratory Birds, Elk Winter Range Existing Conditions). Reference to MA 16 – Map 16 changes to the Management Area Map in the project file. The reference to Map 12 changes to Map 13.

Page 3-243. (Section 3.12.7.6. Generalist species and Habitat – Lynx, wolf, wolverine, Elk (Winter/Summer Range), Neotropical Migratory Birds, Elk Summer Range Existing Conditions). The reference to Table III-109 changes to Table III-108.

Page 3-243. (Section 3.12.7.6. Generalist species and Habitat – Lynx, wolf, wolverine, Elk (Winter/Summer Range), Neotropical Migratory Birds, Elk Summer Range Direct and Indirect Effects, Alternative A). The reference to Map 15 changes to Map 16.

Page 3-250. (Section 3.12.7.6. Generalist species and Habitat – Lynx, wolf, wolverine, Elk (Winter/Summer Range), Neotropical Migratory Birds). Replace the High-elevation Mixed Conifer Habitat acres in Table III-111 Neotropical Migratory Bird Habitat by Alternative with the following:

**Table III-111 Neotropical Migratory Bird Habitat by Alternative.**

Neotropical Migratory Birds Analysis Indicator	Alt. A	Alt. B	Alt. C	Alt. D	Alt. E
High-elevation Mixed Conifer Habitat acres defined by Photo Interpretation code 205, 301, 302, 403, 404, and 406 in small, medium and large tree sizes (acres treated)	53,450 (0)	49,560 (3,890)	50,450 (3,000)	51,173 (2,277)	51,374 (2,076)

Page 3-251. (Section 3.12.7.6. Generalist species and Habitat – Lynx, wolf, wolverine, Elk (Winter/Summer Range), Neotropical Migratory Birds, High-elevation Mixed Conifer Forest). Replace the last two sentences with Table III-111 shows alternative b would treat the most acres of this habitat (3,890 acres). Alternatives C, D and e would treat 3,000 acres, 2,277 acres and 2,075 acres, respectively.

Page 3-251. (Section 3.12.7.8 Disturbance Associate Species – Black-backed Woodpecker). Insert the following statement into paragraph two, “Samson (2005) supports Rosenberg (2004).” The reference to Map 12 changes to Map 13.

Page 3-253. (Section 3.12.8) Cumulative Effects on Wildlife in Red river Watershed, Location of past activities references Map 9 of the FEIS and should reference Map 9 of the Red River EAWS USDA-FS 2003a).

## FEIS APPENDIX A - REFERENCES

Appendix A. Insert the following references:

- Bissonette, J. A., D. J. Harrison, C. D. Hargis, and T. G. Chapin. 1997. The influence of spatial scale and scale-sensitive properties on habitat selection by American marten. Pages 368-385 in J. A. Bissonette, editor. *Wildlife and Landscape Ecology*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Borniger, Randy. 2004. Personal communications with Michelle Godawa 5/26/2004 regarding elk killed by wolves on winter range.
- Hejl, S.J. 1994. Human-induced changes in bird populations in coniferous forests in western North America during the past 100 years. In: J.R. Jehl and N.K. Johnson, eds. A century of avifaunal change in western North America. *Studies in Avian Biol.* 15:232-246. in <http://biology.umn.edu/landbird/fly.htm> accessed February 2005.
- Hoylan, Jim. 2005. Nez Perce Tribe Wolf Recovery Biologist, personal communications with Michelle Godawa 2/1/2005.
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game. 2005. Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Boise, Idaho.
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game, et al. 1994. Coeur d' Alene Salamander Habitat Conservation assessment and conservation Strategy draft).
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game Nongame Program, Idaho's amphibians and reptiles, Nongame Wildlife Leaflet #7, Boise, Idaho.
- Krohn, W.B., W.J. Zielinski and R.B. Boone. 1997. Relations among fishers, snow, and martens in California: results from small-scale spatial comparisons. Pages 211-232 in *Martes: taxonomy, ecology, techniques, and management*. G. Proulx, H.N. Bryant and P.M. Woodard, eds. 1997. Prov. Mus. Alta, Edmonton, AB. 474 pp.
- Peterjohn, B.G.; Sauer, J. R.; Link, W. A. 1996. The 1994 and 1995 summary of the North American Breeding Bird Survey. Bird Populations 3: 48-66. in <http://biology.umn.edu/landbird/fly.htm> accessed February 2005.
- Ruediger, B. et al. 2000. Canada lynx conservation assessment and strategy. USDA Forest Service, USDI Bureau of Land Management, and USDI National Park Service. Forest Service Publication #R1-00-53, Missoula, MT. 142 pp.
- Ruggiero et al., 1994. The Scientific Basis for Conserving Forest Carnivores: American Marten, Fisher, Lynx and Wolverine in the Western United States. USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, General Technical Report RM-254, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Samson, F. B. 2005. A conservation assessment of the northern goshawk, black-backed woodpecker, flammulated owl, and pileated woodpecker in the Northern Region, USDA Forest Service. Unpublished report on file, Northern Region, Missoula, Montana, USA.
- Samson, F. B. 2006. Habitat estimates for maintaining viable populations of the northern goshawk, black-backed woodpecker, flammulated owl, pileated woodpecker, American marten, and fisher. USDA Forest Service Northern Region. Missoula, MT. Unpublished June 2006.
- Sharp, B. E. 1996. Avian population trends in the Pacific Northwest. Bird Populations 3: 26-45. in <http://biology.umn.edu/landbird/fly.htm> accessed February 2005.
- USDA-FS Fire Effects Information System. Lodgepole pine importance to livestock and wildlife. <http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/plants/tree/pinconl/all.html#IMPORTANCE%20TO%20LIVESTOCK%20AND%20WILDLIFE> accessed November 2004.
- U.S.D.I - Fish and Wildlife Service, Nez Perce Tribe, National Park Service, and USDA Wildlife Services. 2004. Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery 2003 Annual Report. T. Meier, ed. USFWS, Ecological Services, 100 N Park, Suite 320, Helena MT. 65 pp.

**This page left intentionally blank.**